arXiv:1412.5136v2 [math.ST] 13 Jan 2016

WEIGHTED M-ESTIMATORS FOR MULTIVARIATE CLUSTERED DATA: THEORY AND SIMULATION RESULTS

MOHAMMED EL ASRI, DELPHINE BLANKE, EDITH GABRIEL

Avignon University, LMA EA2151
Campus Jean-Henri Fabre, 301 rue Baruch de Spinoza,
BP 21239, F-84916 AVIGNON Cedex 9.

Abstract. We study weighted M-estimators for $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued clustered data and give sufficient conditions for their consistency. Their asymptotic normality is established with estimation of the asymptotic covariance matrix. We address the robustness of these estimators in terms of their breakdown point. Comparison with the unweighted case is performed with some numerical studies. They highlight that optimal weights maximizing the relative efficiency have a bad impact on the breakdown point.

1. Introduction

M-estimators were first introduced by Huber (1964) as robust estimators of location and gave rise to a substantial literature. For results on their asymptotic behavior and robustness (with the study of the influence function and the breakdown point), two reference books are those of Huber (1981) and Hampel et al. (1986). Concerning more recent works, we may refer to Ruiz-Gazen (2012) for a nice introductory presentation of robust statistics, and to the book of van der Vaart (2000) for results in the multivariate case.

Most of references stand for independent and identically distributed variables. However clustered and hierarchical data frequently arise in applications. Typically the facility location problem is an important research topic in spatial data analysis for the geographic location of some economic activity. In this field, recent studies perform spatial modelling with clustered data (see e.g. Liao and Guo, 2008; Javadi and Shahrabi,

E-mail address: mohammed.elasri@gmail.com, delphine.blanke@univ-avignon.fr, edith.gabriel@univ-avignon.fr.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 62F35, 62G35.

Key words and phrases. M-estimation, Clustered data, Efficiency, Breakdown point.

ANR SYSCOMM, ROLSES 'Robust and Optimal Locations for Sustainable Environment and Systems'.

2014, and references therein). For the multivariate one-sample location problem with clustered data, Nevalainen et al. (2006) study the spatial median for robust estimation. They show that the intra-cluster correlation has an impact on the asymptotic covariance matrix. The weighted spatial median, introduced in their pioneer paper of 2007, has a better efficiency with respect to its unweighted version, especially when clusters' sizes are heterogeneous or in the presence of strong intra-cluster correlation. El Asri (2013) introduces a class of weighted M-estimators which generalizes their work to a boarder class of estimators. Weights are assigned to the objective function that defines M-estimators, the aim is to adapt them to the clustered framework in order to increase their efficiency and/or robustness.

We begin with the consistency of weighted M-estimators and establish their asymptotic normality. Also, we provide consistent estimators of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix. It allows us to derive numerically optimal weights that improve the efficiency of estimation. Finally, from a weight-based formulation of the breakdown point, we illustrate how these optimal weights may lead to its deterioration.

2. The framework

Clusters appear in various domains: one may refer to Lawson and Denison (2002) for current approaches in statistical inference. The framework consists in aggregated data with a homogeneous internal structure. Here, we consider n independent clusters, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, where X_i is made up of m_i $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables X_{ij}, $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$, $m_i \geq 1$. Each X_{ij} has the same distribution $\mathbb{P}_\theta$, $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where Θ is a convex and bounded set with non empty interior. The latter condition is strong, but it allows to derive results in the multivariate case for a general class of weighted M-estimators. It can be dropped when one considers some specific estimators, as for example the spatial median. For each cluster i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we also make the assumption that $(X_{i1}, X_{i2}) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{ik}, X_{ik'})$ for all $k, k' = 1, .., m_i$ with $k \neq k'$. This condition implies that the intra-correlation, say r_i, of a given cluster X_i is the same for all pairs of variables inside but may vary from one cluster to another. The total number of observations is denoted by $N_n := \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$ and we suppose that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_n}{n} = \ell$, with $\ell \in [1, \infty[$. Finally, θ satisfies

$$\theta = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, M(a) := \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathbb{E}_\theta(\rho(X_{11}, a)) = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \int \rho(x, a) dP_\theta(x),$$

where, for all $a \in \Theta$, $a \mapsto \rho(x, a)$ is a measurable function in x from $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.1. *The weighted M-estimator associated with the function ρ is defined by:*

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^w = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}}\ M_n^w(a) \text{ with } M_n^w(a) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij}, a).$$

The values w_{ij}, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$ represent the (non random) positive weights.

If $a \mapsto \rho(\cdot, a)$ is differentiable for $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_d)^T$ in a neighborhood of θ, then the vector of partial derivatives $\psi = (\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial a_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial a_d})^T$ is such that $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\psi(X_{11}, \theta)) = 0$. This leads to an alternative formulation of $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$.

Definition 2.2. *The weighted M-estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ is the value of 'a' satisfying the d-vectorial equality: $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\psi(X_{ij}, a) = 0$.*

Several choices are possible for the weights and $w_{ij} \equiv 1$ returns the unweighted estimators. A particular interesting case corresponds to clusters with the same weight, namely $w_{ij} \equiv w_i$, where the choice of w_i depends on the considered framework. Typically, one may choose $w_i = c/m_i$, $c > 0$, to penalize biggest clusters or $w_i = c/r_i$ to reduce the intra-correlation effect.

3. Asymptotic results

Our asymptotic results are derived under the following conditions (recall that $N_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i$ and $N_n/n \to \ell \geq 1$).

Assumption 3.1 (A3.1)**.** *Let us assume that:*

(a) For all $\epsilon > 0$: $\underset{a\in\Theta:\|a-\theta\|\geq\epsilon}{inf} \mathbb{E}_\theta(\rho(X_{11}, a)) > \mathbb{E}_\theta(\rho(X_{11}, \theta))$;

(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big) = 1$;

(c) $\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}_\theta(\rho^{1+\delta}(X_{11}, a)) < \infty$ *for some δ with*

(i) either $\delta > 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big)^{1+\delta} = 0$;

(ii) or $\delta > 1$, $\sum_{n\geq 1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big)^{1+\delta} < \infty$ *and* $\sum_{n\geq 1}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big)^2\big)^s < \infty$ *for some $s > 0$.*

The condition A3.1(a) guarantees the uniqueness of θ. It is satisfied if ρ is a strictly convex function and the support of $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ is not concentrated on a line (see Milasevic and Ducharme, 1987, for the spatial median). The condition A3.1(c), linked both with function ρ and distribution $\mathbb{P}_\theta$, is standard and is involved in the consistency

of the estimator. Conditions A3.1(b)-(c) depend on the sizes m_i and the weights w_{ij}. A3.1(b) is straightforward in the unweighted case ($w_{ij} \equiv 1$) whereas A3.1(c)-(i) follows easily for e.g. bounded m_i. For the case $w_{ij} \equiv w_i$ with $w_n \to 1$, the Cesàro theorem gives A3.1(b) and again, A3.1(c)-(i) is fulfilled for bounded sequences (m_i) and (w_i). The second condition A3.1(c)-(ii) is the most stringent one and it is involved in the almost sure convergence. Remark that the choice $w_i = \frac{\ell}{m_i}$ fulfills all the conditions. Now, we may derive consistency of our estimators given in Definition 2.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that conditions A3.1(a)-(c) are satisfied and that, for all x, the function $a \mapsto \rho(x,a)$ is $k(x)$-Hölderian:*

$$|\rho(x,a_1) - \rho(x,a_2)| \leq k(x) \left\|a_1 - a_2\right\|^{\lambda},\ 0 < \lambda \leq 1,\ a_1, a_2 \in \Theta$$

with $\mathbb{E}_\theta(k^{1+\delta}(X_{11})) < \infty$ and δ given in A3.1(c). Then, the condition A3.1(c)-(i) gives the P-consistency of $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ while A3.1(c)-(ii) gives its strong consistency.

Proof. With Assumption 3.1, the relation $\|a - \theta\| \geq \epsilon$, for $a \in \Theta$ and some $\varepsilon > 0$, implies that $M(a) > M(\theta) + \eta$ for some $\eta > 0$. So, one gets the inclusion: $\left\{\left\|\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta\right\| \geq \epsilon\right\} \subset \left\{M(\widehat{\theta}_n) > M(\theta) + \eta\right\}$. By this way,

$$\left\{0 \leq M(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) - M(\theta) \leq \eta\right\} \subset \left\{\left\|\widehat{\theta}_n^w - \theta\right\| < \epsilon\right\}.$$

Moreover, the estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ is the minimizer of M_n^w, hence $M_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) \leq M_n^w(\theta)$ and we get:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq M(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) - M(\theta) &= M(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) - M_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) + M_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) - M(\theta) \\ &\leq M(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) - M_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) + M_n^w(\theta) - M(\theta) \leq 2 \sup_{a \in \Theta} |M_n^w(a) - M(a)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the inclusion $\{\sup_{a\in\Theta} |M_n^w(a) - M(a)| < \eta\} \subset \{\|\widehat{\theta}_n^w - \theta\| < \epsilon\}$. The result follows from the uniform consistency of M_n^w established in the next lemma (with proof postponed to the end).

Lemma 3.1. *Under conditions of Theorem 3.1, $M_n^w(a) - M(a)$ converges to 0 uniformly in $a \in \Theta$, either in probability or almost surely.*

□

Remark 3.1. *Theorem 3.1 includes estimators with lipschitzian objective function as the weighted spatial median with $\rho(x,a) = \|x - a\|$ and the weighted Huber estimator derived from $\rho(x,a) = \frac{1}{2}\|x-a\|^2$ if $\|x-a\| \leq k$ and $\rho(x,a) = k\|x-a\| - \frac{1}{2}k^2$ if $\|x-a\| > k$.*

We conclude this part with the asymptotic normality of our estimators. To this aim, we use the following conditions where $\dot{\psi}$ denotes the Hessian of the function $a \mapsto \rho(x,a)$.

Assumption 3.2 (A3.2)**.** *Let us assume that:*

(a) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big) = 1$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2 = c_w < \infty$*;*

(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j'\neq j} w_{ij} w_{ij'} C_{\theta,i} = C_\theta^w$ *with* $C_{\theta,i} = \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{ij},\theta)\psi^T(X_{ij'},\theta)$*;*

(c) $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\|\psi(X_{11},\theta)\|^{2+\eta}) < \infty$ *for some* $\eta > 0$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{N_n^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij})^{2+\eta} = 0$*;*

(d) $\mathbb{E}_\theta\big(\|\dot{\psi}(X_{11},\theta)\|\big)^{1+\delta} < \infty$ *for some* $\delta > 0$ *(with matrix-norm) and* $a \mapsto \dot{\psi}(x,a)$ *is* $k(x)$ *- Hölderian:* $\big\|\dot{\psi}(x,a_2) - \dot{\psi}(x,a_1)\big\| \leq k(x)\,\|a_2 - a_1\|^{\lambda}$ *with* $\mathbb{E}\left(k^{1+\delta}(X_{11})\right) < \infty$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}}{N_n}\big)^{1+\delta} = 0$*.*

If $w_{ij} \equiv w_i$, with $\lim_{n\to\infty} w_n = 1$, the condition A3.2(a) is fulfilled. Moreover if the intra-cluster correlations are the same for all clusters, $C_{\theta,i} = C_\theta$, and if $\lim_{n\to\infty} m_n = \ell$, then one gets $C_\theta^w = (\ell-1)C_\theta$: the condition A3.2(b) is also satisfied. Condition A3.2(c) is involved for the application of the Lindeberg theorem and its last part is fulfilled with the previous choices of weights. Also, it holds true as soon as $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij})^{2+\eta}$ is asymptotically finite. The weighted spatial median is not covered by the condition A3.2-(d), but its study may be direct, as done in Nevalainen et al. (2006). Here our conditions are satisfied with sufficiently smooth ψ functions: in particular the Hölderian condition holds as soon as each element of $\dot{\psi}$ is $k(x)$-Hölderian. By this way, we do not require the second derivative of ψ, which seems reasonable from a robust point of view. In particular, L_p-medians defined by $\widehat{\theta}_n^w = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\,\|X_{ij} - a\|^p$ fulfill these conditions with $p \geq 2$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that* $\widehat{\theta}_n^w \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} \theta$ *and that Assumption 3.2 is fulfilled. Also assume that* $V_\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta(\dot{\psi}(X_{11},\theta))$ *is invertible. Then,*

$$\sqrt{N_n}(\widehat{\theta}_n^w - \theta) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{d} N\left(0, \Sigma_\theta^w\right)$$

where $\Sigma_\theta^w = V_\theta^{-1}\left(c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w\right) V_\theta^{-1}$ *and* $B_\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{11},\theta)\psi^T(X_{11},\theta)$*.*

Proof. First, for $a = (a_1,\ldots,a_d)^T$ in a convex open neighborhood of θ, let us denote

$$\psi(x,a) = \Big(\frac{\partial\rho(x,a)}{\partial a_1},\ldots,\frac{\partial\rho(x,a)}{\partial a_d}\Big)^T =: (\psi_1(x,a),\ldots,\psi_d(x,a))^T.$$

We apply a Taylor expansion with integral remainder:

$$\psi(x,a) = \psi(x,\theta) + \int_0^1 \dot{\psi}(x,\theta + s(a-\theta))^T (a-\theta)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

For $a = \widehat{\theta}_n^w \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} \theta$ and $x = X_{ij}$, we get:

$$\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\psi(X_{ij},\widehat{\theta}_n^w) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\psi(X_{ij},\theta) + \Big(\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\dot{\psi}(X_{ij},\theta)^T + o_p(1)\Big)(\widehat{\theta}_n^w - \theta)$$

where $o_p(1)$ comes from the P-consistency of $\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}k(X_{ij})$, derived from Theorem A.1(1) with conditions A3.2(a) and (d), together with the Hölderian condition made on $\dot{\psi}$.

Next, if $T_n^w(a) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\psi(X_{ij},a)$, then $T_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) = 0$ by definition of $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ and we obtain

$$-\sqrt{N_n}T_n^w(\theta) = \Big(\dot{T}_n^w(\theta) + o_p(1)\Big)\sqrt{N_n}(\widehat{\theta}_n^w - \theta).$$

Next, the two following technical lemmas (with proofs postponed to the end) and the P-consistency of $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ yield the result.

Lemma 3.2. *Under the conditions A3.2(a)-(c),*

$$\sqrt{N_n}T_n^w(\theta) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{d} N\left(0, c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w\right).$$

Lemma 3.3. *If assumptions of Theorem 3.2 hold, we get*

$$\dot{T}_n^w(\theta) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} V_\theta.$$

□

In the independent case (obtained with $m_i \equiv 1$), the asymptotic variance is reduced to $c_w V_\theta^{-1} B_\theta V_\theta^{-1}$ with c_w equal to 1 for the unweighted case ($w_{ij} \equiv 1$). We may deduce that weights are of no use to improve this variance. Actually, the condition A3.2(a) gives $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 1$, so by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get that $c_w = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^2$ is always greater than one. Clustering effects appear through the term C_θ^w, so we may choose the weights to reduce this value in relation to the unweighted case. Finally in the case of equal intra-correlation ($C_{\theta,i} \equiv C_\theta$), it should be noticed that the choice minimizing the variance depends neither on $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ nor on the objective function ρ.

4. Relative efficiency

4.1. **Estimation of the asymptotic variance.** We study the relative efficiency of weighted M-estimators toward their unweighted versions. First, recall that the unweighted case is obtained with $w_{ij} \equiv 1$ for which $\Sigma_\theta^w := \Sigma_\theta = V_\theta^{-1}(B_\theta + C_\theta^m)V_\theta^{-1}$, as $c_w = 1$ by condition A3.2-(a) and $C_\theta^w := C_\theta^m = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^n m_i(m_i-1)C_{\theta,i}$. Variances are compared by using the relative efficiency index defined by

$$E_f = \left[\frac{\det(V_\theta^{-1}\,(B_\theta + C_\theta^m)\,V_\theta^{-1})}{\det(V_\theta^{-1}\,(c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w)\,V_\theta^{-1})}\right]^{\frac{1}{d}} = \left[\frac{\det(\Sigma_\theta)}{\det(\Sigma_\theta^w)}\right]^{\frac{1}{d}}. \tag{4.1}$$

First we propose estimators for these variances and study their consistency under assumptions of Theorem 3.2. To estimate $c_w B_\theta$, we denote $\widehat{B}_n^w(a)$ the matrix defined by:

$$\widehat{B}_n^w(a) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2\psi(X_{ij},a)\psi^T(X_{ij},a).$$

Similarly, estimators of C_θ^w and V_θ are derived from the functionals

$$\widehat{C}_n^w(a) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{j'\neq j}^{m_i} w_{ij}w_{ij'}\psi(X_{ij'},a)\psi^T(X_{ij},a)$$

and $\widehat{V}_n(a) = \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\dot{\psi}^T(X_{ij},a)$. Consistency of these means is derived in the following proposition with proof postponed to the Appendix.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that assumptions of Theorem 3.2 are fulfilled.*
1) If $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^n \big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2}{N_n}\big)^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}} = 0$, *then* $\widehat{B}_n^w(a) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} c_w B_a$, $a\in\Theta$.
2) If $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^n \big(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{j'=1,j'\neq j}^{m_i} w_{ij}w_{ij'}}{N_n}\big)^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}} = 0$, *then* $\widehat{C}_n^w(a) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} C_a^w$, $a\in\Theta$.
3) $\widehat{V}_n(a) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} V_a$, $a\in\Theta$.

Note that these additional conditions are again satisfied for the weights discussed in the previous section. Next, under some additional regularity assumptions on ψ and its derivatives, the previous results turn to be uniform on $a\in\Theta$. This allows us to construct consistent estimators of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix given in Theorem 3.2 by plugging $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ in $\widehat{B}_n^w(a)$, $\widehat{C}_n^w(a)$, $\widehat{V}_n(a)$. We get the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that assumptions of Proposition 4.1 are fulfilled. If moreover,*
1) $\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}_\theta\big\|\psi(X_{11},a)\big\|^{2+\eta} < \infty$ *and*

$$\big\|\psi(x,a_2)\psi^T(x,a_2) - \psi(x,a_1)\psi^T(x,a_1)\big\| \le k(x)\big\|a_2-a_1\big\|^\lambda, \quad \lambda\in]0,1]$$

with $\mathbb{E}_\theta(k^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}(X_{11})) < \infty$, *then* $\widehat{B}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} c_w B_\theta$;

2) $\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}_\theta\big\|\psi(X_{11},a)\big\|^{2+\eta}<\infty$ *and*

$$\big\|\psi(x,a_2)\psi^T(y,a_2)-\psi(x,a_1)\psi^T(y,a_1)\big\|\le k(x,y)\big\|a_2-a_1\big\|^{\lambda},\quad \lambda\in]0,1]$$

with $\mathbb{E}_\theta(k^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}(X_{i1},X_{i2}))<\infty$ *for all* $i=1,\ldots,n$ *and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{j'\neq j}w_{ij}w_{ij'}\mathbb{E}_\theta(k(X_{ij},X_{ij'}))=k_w<\infty,$$

then $\widehat{C}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p}C_\theta$*;*

3) $\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}_\theta\big\|\dot{\psi}(X_{11},a)\big\|^{1+\delta}<\infty$ *then* $\widehat{V}_n(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p}V_\theta$.

Proof. 1) Concerning the term $\widehat{B}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\widehat{B}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-c_wB_\theta\Big\|&\le\Big\|\widehat{B}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-c_wB(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)\Big\|+c_w\Big\|B(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-B_\theta\Big\|\\&\le\sup_{a\in\Theta}\Big\|\widehat{B}_n^w(a)-c_wB(a)\Big\|+c_w\Big\|B(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-B_\theta\Big\|.\end{aligned}$$

The Hölderian condition on $a\mapsto\psi(x,a)\psi^T(x,a)$ gives the continuity of the function $a\mapsto\mathbb{E}\left(\psi(X_{11},a)\psi^T(X_{11},a)\right)$; so the second norm tends to 0 by the P-consistency of $\widehat{\theta}_n^w$ and Slutsky's lemma. It remains to establish the uniform P-consistency of $\widehat{B}_n^w(a)$. This result is derived similarly to the proof of Lemma 3.1: we use again the Hölderian condition on $\psi\psi^T$ by noting that obtained bounds in the proof of Proposition 4.1 are uniform on a since $\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}_\theta\big\|\psi(X_{11},a)\big\|^{2+\eta}<\infty$.

2) The two other terms are studied similarly with the help of:

$$\Big\|\widehat{C}_n^w(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-C_\theta^w\Big\|\le\sup_{a\in\Theta}\Big\|\widehat{C}_n^w(a)-C^w(a)\Big\|+\Big\|C(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-C_\theta^w\Big\|$$

$$\Big\|\widehat{V}_n(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-V_\theta\Big\|\le\sup_{a\in\Theta}\Big\|\widehat{V}_n(a)-V(a)\Big\|+\Big\|V(\widehat{\theta}_n^w)-V_\theta\Big\|.$$

□

4.2. **Numerical results.** Different simulations and analyses were performed with R software (R Core Team, 2014). We use an empirical version of the efficiency E_f defined in (4.1) with Σ_θ and Σ_θ^w respectively replaced by $\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta^w$. Note that here, we use the true value θ in order to compare the asymptotic efficiencies in an ideal setting. For 1000 replications of each case, we compute four configurations of 100 multivariate random variables subdivided in 10 clusters:

(1) C1: 9 clusters of size 4 and 1 cluster of size 64;
(2) C2: 5 clusters of size 4 and 5 clusters of size 16;
(3) C3: 2 clusters of size 4, 1 cluster of size 8, and 7 clusters of size 12;

TABLE 1. Optimal weights for the weighted spatial median, the weighted Huber estimator and the L_p estimator ($p = 3$) obtained for a centered bivariate Gaussian distribution with $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$

	C1			C2			C3			C4		
	m_i	$r = 0.2$	$r = 0.8$	m_i	$r = 0.2$	$r = 0.8$	m_i	$r = 0.2$	$r = 0.8$	m_i	$r = 0.2$	$r = 0.8$
Weighted spatial median	4	2.251	2.487	4	1.818	2.412	4	1.712	2.382	5	1.519	1.939
	4	2.324	2.520	4	1.877	2.444	4	1.765	2.414	6	1.420	1.645
	4	2.232	2.464	4	1.803	2.389	8	1.180	1.243	7	1.262	1.407
	4	2.203	2.460	4	1.780	2.386	12	0.915	0.837	8	1.171	1.241
	4	2.252	2.473	4	1.819	2.398	12	0.911	0.846	9	1.093	1.114
	4	2.291	2.486	16	0.813	0.654	12	0.926	0.851	11	0.989	0.920
	4	2.227	2.482	16	0.789	0.656	12	0.907	0.855	12	0.904	0.852
	4	2.192	2.454	16	0.769	0.638	12	0.900	0.831	13	0.841	0.767
	4	2.281	2.498	16	0.821	0.658	12	0.929	0.859	14	0.840	0.738
	64	0.297	0.167	16	0.784	0.636	12	0.901	0.827	15	0.763	0.665
Weighted-Huber	4	2.268	2.464	4	1.875	2.416	4	1.760	2.393	5	1.567	1.941
	4	2.343	2.520	4	1.937	2.470	4	1.816	2.447	6	1.439	1.659
	4	2.275	2.468	4	1.881	2.419	8	1.199	1.239	7	1.301	1.411
	4	2.216	2.451	4	1.832	2.402	12	0.902	0.830	8	1.171	1.227
	4	2.259	2.464	4	1.868	2.415	12	0.894	0.835	9	1.089	1.104
	4	2.338	2.522	16	0.797	0.650	12	0.922	0.855	11	0.978	0.928
	4	2.289	2.506	16	0.776	0.647	12	0.910	0.850	12	0.902	0.848
	4	2.242	2.441	16	0.753	0.631	12	0.879	0.829	13	0.829	0.765
	4	2.352	2.563	16	0.810	0.662	12	0.940	0.869	14	0.833	0.746
	64	0.276	0.163	16	0.767	0.629	12	0.896	0.826	15	0.749	0.663
Weighted L_3 estimator	4	2.141	2.370	4	1.756	2.320	4	1.654	2.299	5	1.485	1.862
	4	2.314	2.632	4	1.897	2.577	4	1.787	2.554	6	1.478	1.748
	4	2.331	2.538	4	1.911	2.485	8	1.209	1.274	7	1.292	1.442
	4	2.311	2.513	4	1.894	2.460	12	0.900	0.849	8	1.192	1.256
	4	2.145	2.273	4	1.759	2.226	12	0.861	0.772	9	1.036	1.018
	4	2.241	2.424	16	0.777	0.629	12	0.923	0.827	11	0.964	0.897
	4	2.271	2.457	16	0.786	0.635	12	0.911	0.833	12	0.902	0.831
	4	2.095	2.261	16	0.734	0.587	12	0.854	0.770	13	0.788	0.711
	4	2.550	2.808	16	0.862	0.723	12	1.010	0.950	14	0.889	0.814
	64	0.287	0.170	16	0.787	0.659	12	0.922	0.866	15	0.779	0.694

(4) C4: 10 clusters of all sizes from 5 to 15 except 10.

We consider zero mean bivariate models ($\theta = (0,0)^T$) with independent components with Gaussian or Student distribution, the latter with ν degrees of freedom ($\nu \in \{1,3\}$). We give the same intra-cluster correlation $r_i \equiv r \in]0,1[$ to all the clusters and weights are taken to be the same within a given cluster ($w_{ij} \equiv w_i$). Consequently, for all $j \neq j'$: $\mathrm{Cov}\,(X_{ij}, X_{ij'}) = r \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and, $\mathrm{Cov}\,(X_{ij}, X_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ with $i = 1, \ldots, 10$. The M-estimators considered in this study are: the spatial median, the empirical mean, the

TABLE 2. Gaussian distribution: Relative efficiencies w.r.t. to the (weighted) mean and $\widehat{E}_f = (\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$

	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$
	Configuration C1 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1.167	1.068	2.293	1.243	1.208	3.923
Mean	1	1	2.507	1	1	4.036
Huber	1.036	1.017	2.461	1.069	1.064	4.019
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	1.06	1.008	2.385	1.063	1.044	3.964
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	1.257	1.052	2.099	1.275	1.216	3.849
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.614	1.133	1.76	1.629	1.488	3.686
	Configuration C2 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1.078	1.064	1.128	1.066	1.142	1.316
Mean	1	1	1.142	1	1	1.332
Huber	1.029	1.022	1.134	1.048	1.046	1.33
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	1.059	1.044	1.126	1.103	1.095	1.323
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	1.217	1.167	1.095	1.4	1.38	1.313
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.51	1.393	1.054	1.986	1.942	1.303
	Configuration C3 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1.112	1.103	1.032	1.129	1.125	1.091
Mean	1	1	1.040	1	1	1.095
Huber	1.028	1.026	1.038	1.048	1.048	1.095
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	1.059	1.052	1.034	1.100	1.095	1.09
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	1.211	1.193	1.025	1.385	1.375	1.087
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.486	1.447	1.013	1.931	1.911	1.084
	Configuration C4 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1.105	1.096	1.043	1.130	1.126	1.100
Mean	1	1	1.052	1	1	1.103
Huber	1.028	1.025	1.049	1.048	1.048	1.103
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	1.059	1.051	1.045	1.095	1.109	1.098
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	1.210	1.190	1.035	1.365	1.356	1.095
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.477	1.435	1.022	1.87	1.852	1.092

Huber estimator (defined in Remark 3.1), the L_p-medians with $p = 3, 4, 5$. Finally, the results are derived with $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$.

First we optimize the weights to minimize $\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)$ with *Matlab* 2009. Table 1 shows that optimal weights have the same order of magnitude for clusters of the same size, whatever the estimator and the correlation r. These results are in agreement with our theoretical ones. Moreover, we observe that weights decrease as the clusters' sizes increase: as expected, big groups of aggregated data are penalized.

In tables 2 to 4, we report three different measures of efficiency: $(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (weighted case), $(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (unweighted case) and, E_f defined in (4.1), estimated by $\widehat{E}_f = (\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}^w_\theta)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For the Gaussian distribution, $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}}$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}^w_{\text{opt}}$ refer to the estimated variance

TABLE 3. Student distribution with 3 df: Relative efficiencies w.r.t. to the (weighted) median and $\widehat{E}_f = (\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta^w)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$

	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta^{\mathbf{w}})}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{opt}}^{\mathbf{w}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta^{\mathbf{w}})}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{opt}}^{\mathbf{w}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$
	Configuration C1 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	2.273	1	1	3.894
Mean	1.947	2.157	2.518	1.984	1.995	3.917
Huber	1.123	1.225	2.478	1.111	1.145	4.014
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	2.01E+3	1.86E+3	2.096	2.40E+3	2.35E+3	3.814
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	7.14E+4	3.80E+4	1.209	5.72E+4	4.26E+4	2.904
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.54E+6	6.91E+5	1.020	6.28E+5	3.08E+5	1.911
	Configuration C2 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.111	1	1	1.313
Mean	2.078	2.106	1.127	2.059	2.051	1.307
Huber	1.152	1.174	1.133	1.152	1.166	1.328
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	2.22E+3	2.18E+3	1.100	2.10E+3	2.07 E+3	1.299
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	7.2ZE+4	6.63E+4	1.022	3.88e+4	3.51E+4	1.188
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.43E+6	1.300E+6	1.007	4.11E+5	3.41E+5	1.089
	Configuration C3 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.031	1	1	1.09
Mean	2.06	2.017	1.009	1.983	1.927	1.059
Huber	1.131	1.138	1.037	1.102	1.106	1.095
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	4.22E+3	4.24E+3	1.034	4.54E+3	4.55E+3	1.092
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	3.56E+5	3.47E+5	1.006	2.32E+5	2.28E+5	1.075
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.37E+6	1.33E+6	1.000	2.92E+6	2.81E+6	1.049
	Configuration C4 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.042	1	1	1.099
Mean	2.079	2.034	1.019	2.1	2.042	1.069
Huber	1.136	1.44	1.049	1.174	1.178	1.103
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	3.25E+3	3.28E+3	1.052	3.03E+3	3.04E+3	1.101
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	1.40E+5	1.42E+5	1.051	9.48E+4	9.44E+4	1.094
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	2.27E+6	2.29E+6	1.051	9.86E+5	9.75E+5	1.086

of the (weighted) mean while for Student distributions, the (weighted) median is the reference. Not surprisingly, Huber estimators appear more robust toward the distribution. Also, we note that, in the case of a bivariate Gaussian distribution with $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$ (Table 2), the relative efficiency of all optimally weighted M-estimators is improved (compared to their unweighted version) whatever the configuration of clusters. However, the quality improvement depends both on configurations of clusters and the value of ρ. For example, for the first configuration C1 (with one very big cluster), the efficiency of weighted estimators is doubled with respect to cases C2, C3 and C4.

TABLE 4. Cauchy distribution: Relative efficiencies w.r.t. to the (weighted) median and $\widehat{E}_f = (\frac{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\Sigma}_\theta^w)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$

	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\theta^{\mathbf{w}})}{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{opt}}^{\mathbf{w}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\theta^{\mathbf{w}})}{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{opt}}^{\mathbf{w}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\frac{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\theta)}{\det(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{opt}})})^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_\mathbf{f}$
	Configuration C1 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	2.246	1	1	3.868
Mean	2.98E+5	2.13E+5	1.605	2.50E+5	1.42E+5	2.191
Huber	1.161	1.203	2.327	1.181	1.2	3.928
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	8.86E+10	4.72E+10	1.197	8.07E+10	3.27E+10	1.570
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	6.13E+11	3.18E+11	1.166	3.404E+11	1.19E+11	1.353
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	2.41E+11	1.20E+11	1.121	8.59E+10	2.76E+10	1.244
	Configuration C2 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.107	1	1	1.309
Mean	7.99E+6	8.133+6	1.126	8.62E+6	8.16E+6	1.239
Huber	1.161	1.170	1.115	1.169	1.176	1.317
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	2.06E+12	1.946E+12	1.043	1.33E+12	1.278E+12	1.252
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	7.90E+10	7.55E+10	1.058	4.48E+10	3.48E+10	1.014
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	1.16E+11	1.06E+11	1.009	5.66E+9	6.00E+9	1.387
	Configuration C3 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.030	1	1	1.089
Mean	8.27E+5	8.03E+5	1.000	7.98E+5	7.90E+5	1.079
Huber	1.153	1.156	1.033	1.152	1.154	1.092
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	8.62E+11	8.46E+11	1.011	2.65E+11	2.56E+11	1.052
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	2.82E+12	2.74E+12	1.000	4.92E+11	4.70E+11	1.041
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	7.44E+11	7.24E+11	1.002	7.96E+10	7.56E+10	1.034
	Configuration C4 (left: $r = 0.2$, right: $r = 0.8$)					
Median	1	1	1.04	1	1	1.098
Mean	1.55E+6	1.55E+6	1.035	1.39E+6	1.38E+6	1.087
Huber	1.129	1.133	1.043	1.167	1.169	1.100
Lp-Median; $p = 3$	3.75E+12	3.73E+12	1.034	2.63E+12	2.58E+12	1.080
Lp-Median; $p = 4$	3.74E+13	3.70E+13	1.027	1.86E+13	1.81E+13	1.070
Lp-Median; $p = 5$	3.88E+13	3.80E+13	1.020	1.39E+13	1.34E+13	1.059

Namely, in the case $r = 0.2$, the relative efficiency of the weighted Huber estimator decreases from 2.461 for C1 to 1.038 for C3. This highlights the impact of clusters' sizes on the variance: the improvement is even better when sizes are heterogeneous and big clusters are present. The same behaviour is observed for all tested estimators and they exhibit similar values for $\widehat{E}_f$. Next, in presence of a strong correlation ($r = 0.8$), the relative efficiency is also improved: weighted M-estimators have a smaller variance than their unweighted version. Again, presence of big clusters emphasizes this phenomenon. For example, the efficiency of the weighted Huber estimator decreases from 4.019 for

C1 to 1.095 for C3. Finally, we get similar results for the Cauchy and the Student distributions (see tables 3 and 4), where for ease of comparison, the same estimators had been computed even if some of them do not converge.

5. Breakdown point

5.1. **Computation of the breakdown point.** Results of the previous section show that one may adapt weights to minimize the variance of the M-estimators. The benefit over the unweighted version is especially important for big clusters with high intra-correlation where the best relative efficiency is achieved by underweighting them. A consequence is that potential outliers in these clusters have reduced impact. A possible measure of such robustness is the breakdown point. We recall here the definition given in Donoho and Huber (1983) (see also Davies and Gather (2005) for a discussion paper around this notion).

Definition 5.1. *The finite sample replacement breakdown point of $\widehat{\theta}_n(X)$ built with n observations is defined by:*

$$\epsilon_n^* = \min_{1\leq k\leq n}\left\{\frac{k}{n} : \sup_{Y_k}\left\|\widehat{\theta}_n(Y_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n(X)\right\| = \infty\right\}$$

where Y_k denotes the corrupted sample from X, obtained by replacing k points of X with arbitrary values.

We denote by $\widehat{\theta}_n(X)$ and $\widehat{\theta}_n^w(X)$ the unweighted and weighted M-estimators based on X. We reorganize the indexation in $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{N_n}\}$ with associated weights $\{w_1, \ldots, w_{N_n}\}$, so these estimators can be written as

$$\widehat{\theta}_n(X) = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{N_n}\rho(X_i, a) \text{ and } \widehat{\theta}_n^w(X) = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{N_n} w_i\rho(X_i, a).$$

Their breakdown points are $\epsilon_{N_n}^* = \min\limits_{1\leq k\leq N_n}\left\{\frac{k}{N_n} : \sup\limits_{Y_k}\left\|\widehat{\theta}_n(Y_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n(X)\right\| = \infty\right\}$ and

$$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*} = \min_{1\leq k\leq N_n}\left\{\frac{k}{N_n} : \sup_{Y_k}\left\|\widehat{\theta}^w(Y_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n^w(X)\right\| = \infty\right\} \tag{5.1}$$

where Y_k is again the corrupted sample from X with k arbitrary values. In this finite framework, we suppose that $\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij} = 1$, that can be written as $\sum_{i=1}^{N_n} w_i = N_n$ with the new indexation. The following result gives two bounds for $\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*}$ depending on the weights. For conciseness and clarity, we choose them as rational: $w_i = \frac{\ell_i}{L}$ for some $L \geq 1$.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that the breakdown point of $\widehat{\theta}_n(X)$ is such that: for all integers $m \geq 1$, $\epsilon_{N_n}^* \leq \epsilon_{mN_n}^* \leq \epsilon_0^*$ where ϵ_0^* represents the asymptotic breakdown point. The*

estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n^w(X)$ *has a breakdown point* $\frac{k_w^*}{N_n}$ *with* $k_w^* \in [[k_N^*, k_0^*]]$ *and the bounds* k_N^* *and* k_0^* *are respectively defined by:*

$$k_N^* = \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ k : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_k} \ge \epsilon_{N_n}^* N_n \right\},$$
$$k_0^* = \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ k : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_k} \ge \epsilon_0^* N_n \right\}.$$

Proof. We follow the main steps of the proof given in Nevalainen et al. (2006) for the breakdown point of the spatial median. Clearly k corresponds to the number of variables in Y_k not present in X: $k = \#\{Y_k \setminus (Y_k \cap X)\}$ with $\#\{A\}$ the cardinal of A. From the definition of $\widehat{\theta}_n(X)$, we get that $\sup_{Y_k} \left\| \widehat{\theta}_n(Y_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n(X) \right\| = \infty$ is equivalent to $\{k \ge \epsilon_{N_n}^* N_n\}$, so that:

$$\sup_{Y_k} \left\| \widehat{\theta}_n(Y_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n(X) \right\| = \infty \Longleftrightarrow \left\{ \#\{Y_k \setminus (Y_k \cap X)\} \ge \epsilon_{N_n}^* \#\{X\} \right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

For $w_i = \frac{\ell_i}{L}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N_n$ and $\ell_i, L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the weighted M-estimator can be written as $\widehat{\theta}_n^w(X) = \underset{a\in\Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{N_n L} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \ell_i \rho(X_i, a)$. Therefore $\widehat{\theta}_n^w(X)$, associated with X, is also the unweighted estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n(\widetilde{X})$ where $\widetilde{X}$ is defined by each X_i of X repeated ℓ_i times (and similarly for the set $\widetilde{Y}_k$ deduced from Y_k). These transformations allow us to write the breakdown point given by (5.1) as:

$$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*} = \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ \frac{k}{N_n} : \sup_{\widetilde{Y}_k} \left\| \widehat{\theta}_n(\widetilde{Y}_k) - \widehat{\theta}_n(\widetilde{X}) \right\| = \infty \right\}.$$

Next, using (5.2) and the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \ell_i = LN_n$, we obtain

$$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*} = \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ \frac{k}{N_n} : \#\{\widetilde{Y}_k \setminus (\widetilde{Y}_k \cap \widetilde{X})\} \ge \epsilon_{LN_n}^* \#\{\widetilde{X}\} \right\},$$

where, if $X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_k}$ are the k points replaced in X, one has to replace $\ell_{i_1} + \cdots + \ell_{i_k}$ points in $\widetilde{X}$ by arbitrary values to obtain $\widetilde{Y}_k$. Moreover $\#\{\widetilde{X}\} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \ell_i = LN_n$, so the breakdown point is given by

$$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*} = \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ \frac{k}{N_n} : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; \ell_{i_1} + \cdots + \ell_{i_k} \ge \epsilon_{LN_n}^* \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \ell_i \right\}$$
$$= \min_{1\le k\le N_n} \left\{ \frac{k}{N_n} : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_k} \ge \epsilon_{LN_n}^* N_n \right\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Let k_w^* be the minimal value obtained in (5.3). By definition of k_0^*, the property $\epsilon_0^* \ge \epsilon_{LN_n}^*$ implies that $w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_{k_0^*}} \ge \epsilon_{LN_n}^* N_n$. Therefore, we may deduce that $k_w^* \le k_0^*$. In the same way, from the definition of k_N^* and the condition $\epsilon_{N_n}^* \le \epsilon_{LN_n}^*$, we also get $k_w^* \ge k_N^*$. □

Remark 5.1. *For the spatial median, one has* $\varepsilon^*_{N_n} = \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{N_n-1}{2} \right\rfloor}{N_n}$ *(Croux and Rousseeuw, 1992). In this case,* $\epsilon^*_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ *and the condition* $\epsilon^*_{N_n} \leq \epsilon^*_{mN_n} \leq \epsilon^*_0$ *is satisfied for all* $m \geq 1$*. In dimension* d *with* $\varepsilon^*_{N_n} = \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{N_n-d+1}{2} \right\rfloor}{N_n}$*, the condition is fulfilled too.*

From Theorem 5.1, the breakdown point of a weighted M-estimator depends more on its weights than on potential outliers. Furthermore, the proof shows that for $w_i = \frac{\ell_i}{L}$, its exact expression takes the form given in (5.3). It is worth noting that if $\epsilon^*_{LN_n}$ and ϵ^*_0 are very closed, we get

$$\epsilon^{w*}_{N_n} = \min_{1\leq k\leq N_n} \left\{ \frac{k}{N_n} : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_k} \geq \epsilon^*_0 N_n \right\}$$

which generalizes the definition given by Nevalainen et al. (2006) for the weighted spatial median (as they use the asymptotic breakdown point of 0.5 to derive their results). We conclude with two remarks: weights do not improve the asymptotic breakdown point of the unweighted case, and, a trade off between optimal efficiency and maximal breakdown point, should be found.

Remark 5.2. *Suppose that the weighted estimator achieves its maximal breakdown point,* $\epsilon^{w*}_{N_n} = \frac{k^*_0}{N_n}$*, with* k^*_0 *such that*

$$k^*_0 = \min_{1\leq k\leq N_n} \left\{ k : \exists\, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N_n\} \;\middle|\; w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_k} \geq \epsilon^*_0 N_n \right\}.$$

If the weights w_i *are ranked in ascending order:* $w_{(1)} < \cdots < w_{(N_n)}$*, the minimality of* k *is guaranteed by replacing the observations with the largest* k^*_0 *weights where* k^*_0 *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} w_{(N_n)} + \cdots + w_{(N_n - k^*_0 + 1)} \geq \epsilon^*_0 N_n \\ w_{(N_n)} + \cdots + w_{(N_n - k^*_0 + 2)} < \epsilon^*_0 N_n. \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

From the last remark, the minimal improvement of the unweighted breakdown point corresponds to $k^*_0 = \epsilon^*_0 N_n + 1$ where, for the sake of clarity, we choose N_n such that $\epsilon^*_0 N_n$ is again an integer. The second part of (5.4) becomes $\sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon^*_0 N_n - 1} w_{(N_n - i)} < \epsilon^*_0 N_n$. As this sum includes $\epsilon^*_0 N_n$ terms, necessarily one gets that $w_{(N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n + 1)} < 1$, so $w_{(1)} \leq \cdots \leq w_{(N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n)} \leq w_{(N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n + 1)} < 1$. This leads us to a contradiction: on one hand $\sum_{i=1}^{N_n} w_{(i)} = N_n$, and on the other hand, $\sum_{i=1}^{N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n} w_{(i)} < N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n$ and $\sum_{i=N_n - \epsilon^*_0 N_n + 1}^{N_n} w_{(i)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon^*_0 N_n - 1} w_{(N_n - i)} < \epsilon^*_0 N_n$. The asymptotic breakdown point of the unweighted case could not be increased.

Remark 5.3. *If the maximal breakdown point of the unweighted version (obtained with* $w_i \equiv 1$*) is a proportion* ϵ^*_0 *(with* $0 < \epsilon^*_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$*) of the data, then from the first equation*

of (5.4)*, we have to overweight (with weights not smaller than one)* $\epsilon_0^* N_n$ *observations in* $\widehat{\theta}_n^w(X)$ *to reach this value.*

We conclude that, at least in the case where $w_{ij} \equiv w_i$, there is no hope to simultaneously maximize the breakdown point and the relative efficiency (since the smallest weights are assigned to the biggest clusters and, consequently to the maximal number of variables). This fact is illustrated in the following section.

5.2. **Numerical results.** In this part we evaluate the breakdown point of the weighted spatial median and the weighted Huber estimator, whose unweighted versions have a maximal breakdown point of 0.5. We consider the configurations C1-C4 defined in section 4.2 and a centered bivariate Gaussian distribution with $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$. We select the optimal weights (with $w_{ij} \equiv w_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 10$) maximizing the relative efficiency (see Table 1). The breakdown points, computed for these two estimators, are presented in Table 5: in each case, they are far less than 50%. Variations are observed according to the number of variables by clusters and value of correlation. Both a strong correlation and the presence of big clusters worsen the breakdown point (see for example the case of configuration C1). The most favorable configuration seems to be C3: it corresponds to a maximal size of clusters limited to 12. We conclude that optimal weights improve significantly the efficiency but can drastically reduce the breakdown point.

TABLE 5. Breakdown point ϵ_n^{w*} for the weighted spatial median and the weighted Huber estimator

		Weighted spatial median			
		C1	C2	C3	C4
$r = 0.2$	$w_{(N_n)} + \ldots + w_{(N_n-k-1)}$	51.921	50.173	50.817	50.081
	$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*}$	23%	37%	46%	41%
$r = 0.8$	$w_{(N_n)} + \ldots + w_{(N_n-k-1)}$	52.099	50.079	50.177	50.293
	$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*}$	21%	23%	41%	36%

		Weighted Huber estimator			
		C1	C2	C3	C4
$r = 0.2$	$w_{(N_n)} + \ldots + w_{(N_n-k-1)}$	50.118	50.326	50.055	50.611
	$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*}$	22%	36%	45%	41%
$r = 0.8$	$w_{(N_n)} + \ldots + w_{(N_n-k-1)}$	51.985	50.443	50.117	50.219
	$\epsilon_{N_n}^{w*}$	21%	23%	41%	36%

Appendix A. Proof of the auxiliary results

A.1. **Proof of Lemma 3.1.** We make use of two limit theorems for independent random variables: the weak law of Chow and Teicher (1997, p. 356) and the strong one of Ordóñez Cabrera and Sung (2002). For the sake of completeness, we state below their main results in a version suitable for our purposes.

Theorem A.1. *For each $n \geq 1$, let $Y_{in}, i = 1, \ldots, n$ be independent r.v.s and $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{in}$.*

(1) If $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}|^{1+\delta}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$ for some $\delta > 0$, then $S_n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right)$ converges to 0 in probability.

(2) If $\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right) = 0$, $\sum_{n\geq 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}|^{1+\delta}\right) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 1$, and for some $s > 0$, $\sum_{n\geq 1} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}|^{2}\right)\Big)^{s} < \infty$, then S_n converges to 0 almost surely.

Remark that in the original version of Chow and Teicher, the result is given in the form $S_n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\mathbb{I}_{\{|Y_{in}|<1\}}\right) \to 0$ in probability. Applying Hölder and Markov inequalities, one obtains easily that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\mathbb{I}_{\{|Y_{in}|<1\}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right) + o(1)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}|^{1+\delta}\right) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

We begin to establish the consistency of $M_n^w(a)$ to $M(a) = \mathbb{E}\left(\rho(X_{11}, a)\right)$ for all $a \in \Theta$. To this end, we set $Y_{in} = \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij}, a)$, these random variables are independent with expectation $\frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\mathbb{E}_\theta(\rho(X_{11}, a))$. Using Minkowski inequality, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}^{1+\delta}\right) \leq \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{w_{ij}}{N_n}\Big)^{1+\delta} \sup_{a\in\Theta} \mathbb{E}\left(\rho^{1+\delta}(X_{11}, a)\right). \tag{a.1}$$

From conditions A3.1(c)-(i), we may deduce that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}|^{1+\delta}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$. Then, for all $a \in \Theta$, the first part of Theorem A.1 gives:

$$\frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij}, a) - \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\mathbb{E}\left(\rho(X_{11}, a)\right)\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} 0. \tag{a.2}$$

By A3.1(b), we have $\frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 1$, so the result: $M_n^w(a) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p} M(a)$.

For the strong consistency, (a.1) with $\delta \geq 1$ shows that $\sum_{n\geq 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in} - \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right)|^{1+\delta}\right)$

and $\sum_{n\geq 1}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{in}-\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right)|^2\right)\Big)^s$ are convergent series under the condition A3.1(c)-(ii). From Theorem A.1-(2), we obtain that:

$$\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij},a)-\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}\mathbb{E}\left(\rho(X_{11},a)\right)\Big)\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{a.s.}0. \tag{a.3}$$

and the convergence of $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{in}\right)$ to $M(a)$ yields the final result.

Now, we turn to the uniform convergence. From the compactness of $\overline{\Theta}$ (where $\overline{A}$ denotes the closure of the set A), we get that $\Theta\subset\bigcup_{l=1}^{r_n}B(a_{ln},h_n)$, with $B(a_{ln},h_n)$ the open ball of center a_{ln} and radius $h_n\to 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{a\in\Theta}|M_n^w(a)-M(a)| &\leq \max_{l=1,\ldots,r_n}\sup_{a\in B(a_{ln},h_n)}|M_n^w(a)-M(a)| \\ &\leq \max_{l=1,\ldots,r_n}\Big(|M_n^w(a_{ln})-M(a_{ln})|+\sup_{a\in B(a_{ln},h_n)}|M_n^w(a)-M_n^w(a_{ln})| \\ &\qquad +|M(a_{ln})-M(a)|\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{a.4}$$

Since $\rho(x,\cdot)$ is $k(x)$-Hölderian, we get the upper bound

$$|M_n^w(a)-M_n^w(a_{ln})|\leq\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}k(X_{ij})\left\|a-a_{ln}\right\|^{\lambda},\ \lambda\in]0,1].$$

Next from the Theorem A.1-(1) and conditions A3.1(b),(c)-(ii), we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}k(X_{ij})\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{p}\mathbb{E}_\theta\big(k(X_{11})\big).$$

We may deduce that for n large enough, the first term of (a.4) is a $\mathcal{O}(h_n^\lambda)$ uniformly in l. The almost sure consistency follows in a similar way from the condition A3.1(c)-(ii). Moreover, the Hölderian condition on $M(a)$ implies the same result for $|M(a_{ln})-M(a)|$. Finally, we study the convergence of the first term $|M_n^w(a_{ln})-M(a_{ln})|$. Now, setting $Y_{in}=\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij},a_{nl})$, we may follow the steps of the first part of the proof because the bound obtained in (a.1) is uniform in a. From (a.2)-(a.3) with a replaced by a_{nl}, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}\rho(X_{ij},a_{nl})-\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}\mathbb{E}_\theta\rho(X_{ij},a_{nl})\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}0$$

either in probability or almost surely. We conclude with

$$|\mathbb{E}\left(M_n^w(a_{nl})\right)-M(a_{nl})|\leq\Big|\frac{1}{N_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}w_{ij}-1\Big|\sup_{a\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}\left(\rho(X_{11},a)\right)=o(1)$$

uniformly in l. Collecting all the results, the uniform convergence of M_n^w to $M(a)$ follows from (a.4).

A.2. **Proof of Lemma 3.2.** We use the multivariate version of the Lindeberg-Feller theorem, see Rao (1973, p. 147). First for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the vectors $\xi_i^w := \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}\psi(X_{ij}, \theta)$ are independent, centred and with variances $V_{\theta,i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, defined by

$$V_{\theta,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2 \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{ij}, \theta)\psi^T(X_{ij}, \theta) + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{m_i} w_{ij} w_{ij'} \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{ij}, \theta)\psi^T(X_{ij'}, \theta).$$

Since all pairs $(X_{ij'}, X_{ij})$, $j \neq j'$, have the same correlation in cluster i, we set $C_{\theta,i} = \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{ij}, \theta)\psi^T(X_{ij'}, \theta)$ and $B_\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta \psi(X_{1j}, \theta)\psi^T(X_{1j}, \theta)$. Then the conditions A3.2(a)-(b) give:

$$\frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{\theta,i} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w.$$

Next as $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_n}{n} = \ell$, one can write:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{\theta,i} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \ell(c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w) := \Sigma.$$

Then, we verify the Lindeberg condition:

$$E_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_\theta\big(\|\xi_i^w\|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\|\xi_i^w\| > \epsilon\sqrt{n}\}} \big) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

Using the Hölder, Minkowski and Markov inequalities, we may bound E_n by

$$E_n \leq \mathbb{E}_\theta\big(\|\psi(X_{11}, \theta)\|^{2+\eta} \big) \frac{1}{\epsilon^\eta n^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij})^{2+\eta} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

with the help of condition A3.2-(c) for all $\epsilon > 0$. Then $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i^w \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, l(c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w)\right)$ so $\sqrt{N_n} T_n^w(\theta)$ is asymptotically normal with covariance matrix $c_w B_\theta + C_\theta^w$.

A.3. **Proof of Lemma 3.3.** We have $\dot{T}_n^w(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij} \dot{\psi}(X_{ij}, \theta)$ and for some $\delta > 0$, $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\dot{\psi}(X_{11}, \theta))^{1+\delta} < \infty$, so the P-consistency of $\dot{T}_n^w(\theta)$ follows from the first part of Theorem A.1 and the condition A3.2(d).

A.4. **Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Let us denote $\widehat{B}_n^{w(k,l)}(a)$, the (k, l) element of the matrix $\widehat{B}_n^w(a)$,

$$\widehat{B}_n^{w(k,l)}(a) = \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2 \psi_k(X_{ij}, a)\psi_l(X_{ij}, a).$$

Again we apply the first part of Theorem A.1 with

$$Y_{in}^{(k,l)} = \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2 \psi_k(X_{ij}, a) \psi_l(X_{ij}, a).$$

With Minkowski and Cauchy Schwarz inequalities, we obtain the bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left| Y_{in}^{(k,l)} \right|^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}} \leq (\mathbb{E} \left| \psi_k^{2+\eta}(X_{11}, a) \right|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \psi_l^{2+\eta}(X_{11}, a) \right| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} w_{ij}^2}{N_n} \right)^{1+\frac{\eta}{2}} = o(1).$$

Next $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left(Y_{in}^{(k,l)} \right) \to c_w \mathbb{E} \left(\psi_k(X_{11}, a) \psi_l(X_{11}, a) \right)$, hence the result.

Proofs are similar for the terms $\widehat{C}_n^w(a)$ and $\widehat{V}_n(a)$. In particular, the P-consistency of $\widehat{V}_n(a)$ follows with the conditions A3.2-(d).

References

Chow, Y. S., Teicher, H., 1997. Probability theory, 3rd Edition. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, independence, interchangeability, martingales.

Croux, C., Rousseeuw, P. J., 1992. A class of high-breakdown scale estimators based on subranges. Comm. Statist. Theory Methods 21 (7), 1935–1951.

Davies, P. L., Gather, U., 2005. Breakdown and groups. Ann. Statist. 33 (3), 977–1035, with discussions and a rejoinder by the authors.

Donoho, D., Huber, P. J., 1983. The notion of breakdown point. In: A Festschrift for Erich L. Lehmann. Wadsworth Statist./Probab. Ser. Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, pp. 157–184.

El Asri, M., 2013. Propriétés asymptotiques des M-estimateurs pondérés pour des données clusterisées. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 351 (11-12), 491–493.

Hampel, F. R., Ronchetti, E. M., Rousseeuw, P. J., Stahel, W. A., 1986. Robust statistics. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.

Huber, P. J., 1964. Robust estimation of a location parameter. Ann. Math. Statist. 35, 73–101.

Huber, P. J., 1981. Robust statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

Javadi, M., Shahrabi, J., 2014. New spatial clustering-based models for optimal urban facility location considering geographical obstacles. J. Ind. Eng. Int. 10 (1), 1–12.

Lawson, A. B., Denison, D. G. T., 2002. Spatial cluster modelling: an overview. In: Spatial cluster modelling. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 1–19.

Liao, K., Guo, D., 2008. A clustering-based approach to the capacitated facility location problem. T. GIS, 323–339.

MATLAB, 2009. version 7.9.0.529 (R2009b). Natick, Massachusetts.

Milasevic, P., Ducharme, G. R., 1987. Uniqueness of the spatial median. Ann. Statist. 15 (3), 1332–1333.

Nevalainen, J., Larocque, D., Oja, H., 2006. A weighted spatial median for clustered data. Stat. Methods Appl. 15 (3), 355–379 (2007).

Nevalainen, J., Larocque, D., Oja, H., 2007. On the multivariate spatial median for clustered data. Canad. J. Statist. 35 (2), 215–231.

Ordóñez Cabrera, M., Sung, S. H., 2002. On complete convergence of weighted sums of random elements. Stochastic Anal. Appl. 20 (1), 21–32.

R Core Team, 2014. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, http://www.R-project.org.

Rao, C. R., 1973. Linear statistical inference and its applications, 2nd Edition. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

Ruiz-Gazen, A., 2012. Robust statistics: a functional approach. Ann. I.S.U.P. 56 (2-3), 49–63.

van der Vaart, A. W., 2000. Asymptotic statistics. Cambridge series in statistical and probabilistic mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (UK), New York (N.Y.).